APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,237	07/28/2003	Steven G. Henry	200208277-1	6611

22879   7590   10/02/2007
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
PHAM, THIERRY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
10/629,237</td><td colspan="2">Applicant(s)
HENRY ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Thierry L. Pham</td><td>Art Unit
2625</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 August 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,16-27 and 29-40* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14, 16-27, 29-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

● This action is responsive to the following communication: an Amendment filed on 8/29/07.

● Claims 1-14, 16-27, 29-40 are currently pending; claims 15 & 28 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14, 16-27, 29-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Twede (US 20030103232), and in view of Monty et al (US 2001/0019416).

Regarding claim 1, Twede discloses a method of automating a workflow, comprising:

● transmitting (network, fig. 1), to a multifunction peripheral (printing device, fig. 1), information that identifies a name and a present state of the workflow (workflow, fig. 5, par. 21) at the multifunction peripheral;

● the multifunction peripheral (printing device, fig. 1) accepting, by way of a user input, a modification (modification, par. 46-47) to the workflow; and the multifunction peripheral inserting (insert via user interface, fig. 5) the modification into the workflow.

Twede, however, fails to teach and/or suggest wherein the accepting includes scanning a document via a scanner, the document having instruction printed thereon.

Monty, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a well-known example of accepting includes scanning a document via a scanner, the document having instruction printed thereon (marked proof sheet 58 including order form of fig. 4 having instruction printed thereon is scanned by scanner 14, fig. 8 & 11, abstract and par. 8-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify workflow of Twede to include a printed workflow (e.g.

marked proof sheet with order form having printed instructions) as taught by Monty because of a following reason: (●) allowing a user to easily specify the image processing operations to be performed, and the image processing parameters to be used for different ones of a set of digital images (via using proof sheet) without require complex, repetitive, or on-going interactions with the processing system (par. 7)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Twede with Monty to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, additionally comprising saving the modification and the workflow in a storage device (save icon 210, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 3, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the modification (modification, par. 46-47) is the addition of a task to the workflow.

Regarding claim 4, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the modification (modification, par. 46-47) is the deletion of a task to the workflow.

Regarding claim 5, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the modification (modification, par. 46-47) pertains to receiving a user input at the multifunction peripheral (fig. 4, 7-8).

Regarding claim 6, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the modification pertains to printing (printing, fig. 7-8) a document at the multifunction peripheral.

Regarding claim 7, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the modification pertains to one of receiving and transmitting a facsimile (fig. 4) of a document at the multifunction peripheral.

Regarding claim 8, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the modification pertains to scanning (fig. 4) a document into the multifunction peripheral.

Regarding claim 9, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the modification pertains to a task that is to be performed at a multifunction peripheral that performs a subsequent task (e.g. store, print, email, and etc, fig. 4) in the workflow.

Regarding claim 10, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the modification pertains to a task that is to be performed at a multifunction peripheral that performs a previous task (par. 46-47) in the workflow.

Regarding claim 11, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of presenting a list of tasks (list of tasks, fig. 4) of the workflow.

Regarding claim 12, Twede further discloses the method of claim 11, wherein at least one task of the list of tasks corresponds to a task that has been previously performed (par. 46-47) in the workflow.

Regarding claim 13, Twede further discloses the method of claim 11, wherein at least one task of the list of tasks corresponds to a task that has not yet been (new tasks, fig. 4, par. 46-47) performed in the workflow.

Regarding claim 14, Twede further discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the user placing the multifunction peripheral into a workflow-training mode (fig. 8).

Regarding claim 16, Monty further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the printed list includes a bar-coded label (using barcode to identify information is well known and widely use in the art) that identifies the printed list and the present state of the workflow to the multifunction peripheral.

Regarding claim 17, Twede discloses a system for automating tasks (fig. 8) of a workflow (workflow, fig. 8), comprising:

● a computing device (computing device 102, fig. 1) that accepts inputs identifying at least some of the tasks of the workflow (par. 21);

● a plurality of multifunction peripherals (printing devices, fig. 1) that perform the at least some tasks of the workflow, wherein the plurality of the multifunction peripherals accepts inputs (fig. 4, par. 46-47) that modify the workflow.

Twede, however, fails to teach and/or suggest wherein the accepting includes scanning a document via a scanner, the document having instruction printed thereon.

Monty, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a well-known example of accepting includes scanning a document via a scanner, the document having instruction printed thereon (marked proof sheet 58 including order form of fig. 4 having instruction printed thereon is scanned by scanner 14, fig. 8 & 11, abstract and par. 8-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify workflow of Twede to include a printed workflow (e.g. marked proof sheet with order form having printed instructions) as taught by Monty because of a following reason: (●) allowing a user to easily specify the image processing operations to be performed, and the image processing parameters to be used for different ones of a set of digital images (via using proof sheet) without require complex, repetitive, or on-going interactions with the processing system (par. 7)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Twede with Monty to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Regarding claim 18, Twede further discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the computing device includes a memory (save icon 210, fig. 4) that stores the workflow modified by the accepted inputs.

Regarding claim 19, Twede further discloses the system of claim 17, further comprising a storage device (fig. 10) that stores the workflow modified by the accepted inputs.

Regarding claim 20, Twede further discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the tasks of the workflow include printing material (printing, fig. 4) using at least one of the plurality of multifunction peripherals.

Regarding claim 21, Twede further discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the tasks of the workflow include scanning (scanning, fig. 4) material into at least one of the plurality of the multifunction peripherals.

Regarding claim 22, Twede further discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the inputs that modify (modification, par. 46-47) the workflow are user inputs that add a task to the workflow.

Regarding claim 23, Twede further discloses the system of claim 22, wherein the task added (modification, par. 46-47) to the workflow is a request for a user input at one of the plurality of multifunction peripherals.

Regarding claim 24, Twede further discloses the system of claim 22, wherein the task added to the workflow is a task that instructs one of the plurality of the multifunction peripherals to print (printing, fig. 4) a page.

Regarding claim 25, Twede further discloses the system of claim 22, wherein the task added to the workflow is a task that instructs one of the plurality of the multifunction peripherals to accept a page that is scanned (scanning, fig. 4) into one of the plurality of the multifunction peripherals.

Regarding claim 26, Twede further discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the inputs that modify the workflow are user inputs that delete (par. 46-47) a task of the workflow.

Regarding claim 27, Twede further discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the inputs that modify the workflow are in the form of a list (lists, fig. 4) having machine-readable markings that identify a name and a present state of the workflow and at least some of the tasks of the workflow.

Regarding claim 29, Twede discloses in a multifunction peripheral (printing device, fig.1), a method for modifying a workflow, comprising: receiving a list of workflow tasks (workflow tasks, fig. 4) from a communications network; presenting at least some of the workflow tasks to a user via a user interface (user interface, fig. 4); accepting (accepting via user interface, fig. 4) a modification to the workflow via the user interface; and inserting the modification (modify workflow, par. 46-47) into the workflow.

Twede, however, fails to teach and/or suggest wherein the accepting includes scanning a document via a scanner, the document having instruction printed thereon.

Monty, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a well-known example of accepting includes scanning a document via a scanner, the document having instruction printed thereon (marked proof sheet 58 including order form of fig. 4 having instruction printed thereon is scanned by scanner 14, fig. 8 & 11, abstract and par. 8-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify workflow of Twede to include a printed workflow (e.g. marked proof sheet with order form having printed instructions) as taught by Monty because of a following reason: (●) allowing a user to easily specify the image processing operations to be performed, and the image processing parameters to be used for different ones of a set of digital images (via using proof sheet) without require complex, repetitive, or on-going interactions with the processing system (par. 7)

Regarding claim 36, Twede further discloses a system (system, fig. 1) for automating a workflow, comprising:

● means for accepting (control panel interface, fig. 4) a list of tasks (list of tasks workflow, fig. 4) of the workflow, the tasks of the workflow being performed by at least one multifunction peripheral (printing device, fig. 1;

● means for presenting to a user (user interface, fig. 4), by way of the at least one multifunction peripheral, at least some of the tasks of the workflow; and

● means for accepting from the user a change (modification, par. 46-47) to the order of the tasks performed by the multifunction peripheral.

Twede, however, fails to teach and/or suggest wherein the accepting includes scanning a document via a scanner, the document having instruction printed thereon.

Monty, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a well-known example of accepting includes scanning a document via a scanner, the document having instruction printed thereon (marked proof sheet 58 including order form of fig. 4 having instruction printed thereon is scanned by scanner 14, fig. 8 & 11, abstract and par. 8-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify workflow of Twede to include a printed workflow (e.g. marked proof sheet with order form having printed instructions) as taught by Monty because of a following reason: (●) allowing a user to easily specify the image processing operations to be performed, and the image processing parameters to be used for different ones of a set of digital images (via using proof sheet) without require complex, repetitive, or on-going interactions with the processing system (par. 7)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Twede with Monty to obtain the invention as specified in claim 36.

Regarding claim 37, Twede further discloses the system of claim 36, wherein the means for accepting the list of tasks further comprises a network interface (network, fig. 1) that permits the at least one multifunction peripheral to communicate with a second multifunction peripheral.

Regarding claim 38, Twede further discloses the system of claim 36, wherein the means for presenting the at least some of the tasks of the workflow is a display (control panel display, fig. 4) located on the peripheral.

Regarding claim 39, Twede further discloses the system of claim 36, wherein the means for accepting a change to the order of the tasks performed by the multifunction peripheral includes a means for detecting that a bubble (icon bubble, fig. 4) has been filled in at a particular location.

Regarding claim 40, Twede further discloses the system of claim 36, wherein the means for accepting a change to the order of the tasks performed by the multifunction peripheral includes a touch screen (touch screen, fig. 4).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 17, 29, and 36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection via newly found prior art reference due to newly added features/limitations (e.g. wherein the accepting includes scanning a document via a scanner, the document having instruction printed thereon).

Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 8/29/07, with respect to claim 16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 112, 2nd paragraph rejection of claim 16 has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thierry L. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-7439. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thierry L. Pham

GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER